

- Mus. Zool. Univ. Michigan* 150 : 4), is to be considered as not having been rejected as a secondary homonym in any paper published prior to the proposed ruling ;
- (b) to place the generic name *Arizona* Kennicott, 1859 (gender : feminine) type-species, by monotypy *Arizona elegans* Kennicott, 1859, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology ;
- (c) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the following names :
- (i) *elegans* Shaw, 1802, as published in the combination *Coluber elegans*, as defined by its lectotype (Brit. Mus. (Nat. Hist.) No. 1946. 1.8.8), selected by Williams and Smith, 1962 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 19 : 300) ;
- (ii) *elegans* Kennicott, 1859, published in the combination *Arizona elegans* and validated under (4)(a) above ;
- (iii) *arizonae* Boulenger, 1894, as published in the combination *Coluber arizonae*, and defined by its lectotype (Brit. Mus. (Nat. Hist.) No. 90.7.30.40) selected by Klauber, 1946 (*Trans. San Diego Soc. nat. Hist.* 10(17) : 322) ;
- (d) place on the Official Index of Invalid and Rejected Specific Names in Zoology the name *arenicola* Dixon, 1960, as published in the combination *Arizona elegans arenicola* (an objective junior synonym of *arizonae* Boulenger, 1894, a name placed on the Official List in para. (c)(i) above).

It would be possible to save the name *arenicola* by suppressing the name *arizonae* under the plenary powers for the purposes of the Law of Priority, but not for those of Homonymy, in addition to the actions requested above under (a), (b), (c)(i)(ii), while then at the same time the name *arizonae* would have to be placed on the Official Index and *arenicola* on the Official List. It does not seem justified, however, to involve the plenary powers to this end.

#### REVISION OF THE PETITION FOR VALIDATION OF *ARIZONA ELEGANS* KENNICOTT Z.N.(S.) 1454

By Kenneth L. Williams and Hobart M. Smith (*Dept. Zoology, University of Illinois, Urbana*)

The alternative proposal submitted by Dr. Holthuis contains a number of points with which agreement is a matter of course. Certainly it must be agreed that "validity" is a property unique to but one name for any species, whereas "availability" is a property common to an unlimited number of names applicable to any one species. These are concepts made clear by the 1961 Code and certainly accepted by us as attested by several articles by one of us on precisely this point (*e.g.*, 1962, *Syst. Zool.* 11 : 139-142, fig. 1).

It was our understanding that placement of any name on the Official List *ipso facto* renders it "valid", in the sense agreed to above, because the first (1958) instalment of the Official List specifically states (p. xii) that "a specific name once stabilized in this way is to be used in preference to any other name for the species concerned and . . . is not to be replaced by any other [trivial] name, even if later it is found either (1) that the [trivial] name in question is not an available name, or (2) that it is not the oldest available [trivial] name for the species in question, unless and until . . . the Commission shall so direct". Surely, then, placement of the name *Arizona elegans* on the Official List would constitute "validation" of the name ; and such inclusion would require exercise of the plenary powers because, as all agree, that name would otherwise be regarded as unavailable through permanent suppression as a secondary homonym. However, if the point remains debateable we are quite willing to rephrase our request, paragraph 14a,

by simply asking that *Arizona elegans* be placed on the Official List. It does not seem to us *essential* to such action that the Commission first determine and eliminate by use of the plenary powers any and all obstacles to both availability and validity. The Commission obviously has the power to make nomenclatural decisions involving zoological considerations as well as strictly nomenclatural matters. If it prefers to operate by means of elimination of all known obstacles prior to inclusion of a name on the Official Lists, then obviously this end would be achieved by ratification of Holthuis's proposals 4(a) and 4(a)(ii), to which we agree if this is indeed the desired procedure.

In only one significant respect do we adhere to a view different from that of Dr. Holthuis: *Coluber arizonae* is, as we see it, a substitute name as of its original proposal by Boulenger in 1894. Obviously it is not a new name at all as of its use in 1895 in the *Zoological Record* for 1894; that use of 1895 was cited in our petition only to give added support, from the author himself, for the understanding that in 1894 the name was proposed as a substitute name and not as a name for a new species. It is true that Boulenger in 1894 did not *then* state that the name was a substitute name, but all we now need to determine is his intent at that time. We have his own word for his intent, to propose a substitute name, given by a year later, and a great deal of corroborative circumstantial evidence is at hand. It is unrealistic to insist that all substitute names be explicitly so designated in taxonomic work of that period; virtually no work did so, but instead *implied* substitution by inclusion of the pertinent synonymy. Boulenger did indeed include a sufficient synonymy to enable any subsequent student to determine why the new name was proposed. We cannot agree that the new name should be regarded as a "new species name" as opposed to substitute name. By our view *arizonae* is not available if, as we ask, *Arizona elegans* is placed on the Official List, and it therefore need not be dealt with further at all (as, for example, by placing it on the Official Index).

Even if *arizonae* were to be regarded by the Commission as a "new species name" (as opposed to a substitute name), we would hold its use in the sense of the limitation initiated by Klauber, 1946, as highly undesirable since (a) the name has been used as valid only once, (b) a better-known alternative (*arenicola*) is in current use, and (c) the name is inappropriate since it, as now limited, would apply to a Texas race and not to any race occurring in Arizona. Appropriateness does not of itself carry any weight but it is not insignificant in combination with the other two factors specified.

We therefore request the Commission to act upon these alternatives:

a. If *Coluber arizonae* Boulenger, 1894, is held to be a substitute name, that Dr. Holthuis's proposals 4(a), (b), (c)(i) and (ii) be combined with Williams and Smith's proposals 14(c), (d), and (f); but that

b. If *Coluber arizonae* Boulenger, 1894, is held to be a "new species name", that Dr. Holthuis's proposals 4(a), (b), (c)(i), and (ii) be combined with Williams and Smith's proposal 14(f) and with the following:

(1) suppression of the name *arizonae* Boulenger, 1894, as proposed in the combination *Coluber arizonae*, for purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the law of Homonymy; and

(2) addition of the name *arizonae* Boulenger, 1894, as above, to the Official Index of Invalid and Rejected Specific Names in Zoology.